

PROPOSED ADOPTION OF A " DECLARATION " CLARIFYING THE QUESTION WHETHER IN THE CASE OF A ZOOLOGICAL NAME IN WHICH TWO ADJACENT VOWELS CONSTITUTE SEPARATE SYLLABLES A SYMBOL SIGNIFYING THE DIAERESIS SHOULD UNDER ARTICLE 20 OF THE " RÈGLES " BE PLACED OVER THE SECOND OF THE VOWELS CONCERNED

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission Reference : Z.N.(S.) 1013)

The purpose of the following note is to draw attention to a problem arising out of the decision by the Copenhagen Congress (1953, *Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.* : 57, 58, *Decision* 101) to repeal Article 20 in the *Règles* relating to the use of diacritic marks over letters in words when used as the scientific names of animals, and to seek a decision on the issue so disclosed.

2. It will be recalled that as part of the decision referred to above the Copenhagen Congress agreed that, where on a zoological name being published, a diacritic mark was annexed to one of the letters of which that name was composed—because such a mark had been annexed to the letter in question in the word concerned before it was Latinised for use in zoological nomenclature—an additional vowel should be inserted to indicate that a diacritic mark had been so used. In the case of a name based on a German word, one of the vowels in which had borne an umlaut prior to its being Latinised, Article 20 always provided, as an optional course, for the insertion of the letter "e" to signify the presence in the original word of an umlaut over the preceding vowel. This arrangement will now no doubt become mandatory.

3. The *Règles* have never contained any provision relating to the use or otherwise of the symbol [··] to signify a diaeresis between two adjacent vowels. This was of no practical consequence so long as Article 20 contained a mandatory provision relating to the use of diacritic marks, for it naturally followed that zoologists employed the conventional symbol to indicate a diaeresis where such existed.

4. The situation has, however, been changed by the decision of the Copenhagen Congress that diacritic marks are not in future to be used over or under letters comprised in words used as zoological names, for it is necessary now that a decision should be taken as to the use in zoological names of the symbol denoting a diaeresis.

5. The diaeresis represents a concept quite distinct from that represented by diacritic marks, for it draws attention not to the use of what is essentially a different letter—e.g. the letter “ä” being essentially a letter different from the letter “a”—but to the fact that the second of the two adjacent vowels concerned requires to be pronounced separately. The use of a symbol to indicate a diaeresis provides a useful guide to pronunciation and it seems to me therefore that it would be convenient for the *Règles* to contain a provision authorising and regulating the use of that symbol.

6. It is suggested that the provision in question should read as follows:—

Draft of suggested provision

In the case of a zoological name which either consists of, or is compounded with, a word in which, prior to its use as such a name, two adjacent vowels were separated into two syllables by a diaeresis, this division is to be indicated by the use of the symbol [·] placed over the vowel which constitutes the second syllable. *Example*: The vowels of the name “Chloe” are divided into two syllables by a diaeresis. Accordingly, when this word is used as a zoological name, it should be written as *Chloë* and not as *Chloe*.

7. In submitting the foregoing proposal, I have pleasure in acknowledging the assistance and advice rendered by Professor the Reverend L. W. Grensted, Consulting Classical Adviser to the International Commission.